

CITY OF CHULA VISTA

**GROWTH MANAGEMENT
OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

2012 ANNUAL REPORT

Threshold Review Period 7/1/10 to 6/30/11

June 7, 2012

*Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 11-19) and
City Council (Resolution No. 2011-___) on June 7, 2012*

GMOC Members

Armida Torres, Chair (Business)
Russ Hall, Vice Chair (Center City)
Carl Harry (Development)
David Danciu (Southwest)
David W. Krogh (Sweetwater/Bonita)
Francisco Sevilla (Education) VACANT as of 3.19.12
Mark Liuag (Planning Commission Representative)
Regina Ong-Garcia (Southeast)
VACANT (Environmental)

City Staff

Kimberly Vander Bie – Associate Planner/
Growth Management Coordinator
Patricia Laughlin – Management Assistant
Ed Batchelder – Advance Planning Manager

City of Chula Vista
Development Services Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
(619) 691-5101

www.chulavistaca.gov

GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: June 7, 2012

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council
Members of the Planning Commission
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Armida Torres, Chair
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: Executive Summary - 2012 GMOC Annual Report

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit its 2012 annual report for your consideration and action. In reviewing information for this year's report, it became very apparent to the GMOC that city budget cuts and staff reductions in recent years have taken a toll in almost all of the areas monitored by this Commission. Drainage channels and parks are not maintained as well as they should be; recreation facilities and libraries are open less frequently; and police and fire response times have slowed down, to name a few of our observations.

Threshold Standards for seven of the eleven quality-of-life indicators were found to be "compliant," including: Air Quality, Drainage, Fiscal, Parks and Recreation, Schools, Sewer and Water. Threshold standards found to be "non-compliant" were Fire, Libraries, Police (Priority Two) and Traffic. While the details of each are outlined in the attached report, the GMOC would like to highlight a few items of special interest.

Fire – For the first time in eight years, response times fell below the threshold standard, which the Fire Department attributed to increased turnout times associated with staff performance issues. The underperformance was not immediately apparent to the Fire Department because data mining was set aside when staffing was reduced. However, the Fire Department has returned to collecting data from individual fire stations and they are addressing performance issues with the companies not meeting the standard.

The GMOC is pleased that the Fire Department has been working to provide an Advance Life Support (ALS) program to make certain the residents of Chula Vista receive the finest and most appropriate emergency medical care in a timely manner. We are concerned, however, that City Council's consideration of the updated Fire Facility Master Plan has been delayed. This delay is affecting timing of the comprehensive PFDIF update, last completed in 2006..

Libraries – For the eighth successive year, Libraries is non-compliant. The GMOC supports the Library Director's determination to explore creative approaches to provide library services to the citizens of the city, and is pleased that a small library branch has been set up at the Otay Ranch Town Center, replacing the former branch at Eastlake High School. However, we are frustrated that the updated Library Facility Master Plan, which would outline concrete interim and long-term solutions to the perpetual square footage deficit, has been postponed for consideration by City Council until a strategic plan is updated.

Police – The Police Department is operating with the lowest number of officers in the county (per 1,000 persons), and there is a need to clarify the way that the response times are being reported, which we presented in last year's Annual Report and which is being addressed through the top-to-bottom review process. Although the Police Priority One threshold standard has not been greatly affected by the reporting process and continues to be in compliance after several consecutive years, the Police Priority Two threshold standard is non-compliant for the 14th year in a row. The GMOC has concluded that modifications to the Police thresholds are necessary, and we would appreciate Council's support when those changes are proposed in a revised growth management ordinance resulting from the top-to-bottom process.

Traffic – Heritage Road continues to be a challenging arterial segment to comply with the threshold standard. It has been consistently out of compliance for several years, in either the northbound or southbound direction. During this reporting period, northbound Heritage Road between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road was out of compliance, which the city engineers attributed to signal timing issues. Apparently, during this review period, the city was operating without a full-time signal systems engineer. The GMOC supports restoring the signal timing position to a full-time capacity. Southbound Otay Lakes Road, between H Street and Telegraph Canyon Road, was also out of compliance during this review period, and the GMOC is pleased that a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) has been approved to implement road widening improvements.

City engineers also informed the GMOC that the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has incorporated regional light rail trolley improvements into their 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, and the GMOC encourages City Council to continue supporting staff efforts to pursue grade crossing improvements at Palomar Street, H Street and E Street.

Although **Fiscal** was found to be compliant, the GMOC has some concerns. First, the Finance Department stated that they have been waiting to do a comprehensive update of the Public Facilities Developer Impact Fees (PFDIF) (last updated in 2006) until updated facility master plans are adopted by Council. Although three facility master plans (including Fire, Libraries, and Parks and Recreation) were recently updated, Council has postponed considering them for approval until strategic plans or fiscal analyses to accompany them are completed. The timeframe for this additional information may take up to two years. With two potential density increases materializing in the next 18 months, it is imperative that the master plans be adopted promptly so that a comprehensive PFDIF can be completed as soon as any additional dwelling units may be approved by Council.

Our second concern is in regards to Developer Impact Fees (DIF) fees being used to pay debt service. The Finance Department reports that, based on cash flow restraints in the PFDIF, 100% of fee revenues is currently being applied to the PFDIF fund's debt service obligation. They state that when they complete the next comprehensive PFDIF update, they will include an analysis of the percentage of each fee dollar going to pay debt service. It appears to the GMOC that overall debt service costs have increased, which would also need to be factored into the update. Thus, the GMOC underscores its recommendation that Council require the PFDIF to be updated sooner than two years from now. The GMOC also encourages Council to pursue a sustainable economic policy to address service shortages resulting from budget cutbacks.

The GMOC appreciates the time and professional expertise provided by the staff of various city departments (as well as the school districts and water districts) for their input to this year's annual report. The written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC demonstrate the commitment of these dedicated individuals to serve the citizens of Chula Vista.

Table of Contents

GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO	1-2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4-5
1.1 Threshold Standards	4
1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)	4
1.3 GMOC 2012 Annual Review Process	5
1.4 Growth Forecast	5
1.5 Report Organization	5
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	6
3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	7-24
3.1 Libraries.....	7-8
3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	7-8
3.2 Police	9-13
3.2.1 Priority One Threshold Findings	10
3.2.2 Non-Compliant Priority Two Threshold Standard	11-12
3.2.3 Consideration of Permanent Eastern Satellite Office	13
3.3 Traffic	13-14
3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	13
3.4 Fire and Emergency Services.....	14-15
3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	14-15
3.4.2 Fire Facilities Master Plan	15
3.5 Parks and Recreation.....	15-16
3.5.1 Threshold Compliance	16
3.5.2 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan	16
3.6 Fiscal	17-18
3.6.1 Updating Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF)	17-18
3.7 Drainage	18-19
3.6.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels	18-19
3.8 Schools.....	19-20
3.8.1 School District Updates	19-20
3.9 Sewer.....	20-21
3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity	20-21
3.10 Air Quality	21-22
3.10.1 Threshold Compliance	22-23
3.11 Water	23-24
3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands	24
4.0 APPENDICES	25
4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast	
4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Threshold Standards

In November 1987, the City Council adopted a Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista, establishing threshold standards, or “quality-of-life” indicators, for eleven public facility and service topics, including: Air Quality, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks & Recreation, Police, Schools, Sewer, Traffic and Water. The Policy addresses each indicator in terms of a goal, objective(s), threshold standard(s), and implementation measures. Adherence to the threshold standards is intended to preserve and enhance the quality of life and environment of Chula Vista residents, as growth occurs.

1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

The 1987 Threshold Standards Policy also established the creation of the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC), a body appointed by City Council to provide an independent, annual review of Threshold Standards compliance. The GMOC is composed of nine members, representing each of the city’s four major geographic areas; a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development; and a member of the Planning Commission.

There were several commissioner changes during the past year. After serving as the Planning Commission representative for three years, Bryan Felber’s position was filled by Mark Liuag last fall. At the same time, Regina Ong-Garcia filled the Eastern Chula Vista vacancy, and Francisco Sevilla joined the Commission as the Education representative, but he resigned in March. David Danciu became a commissioner in February, filling the Southwestern Chula Vista vacancy. The Environmental position has been vacant since Duane Bazzel’s resignation last fall; therefore, two positions are currently vacant: Education and Environmental. The Sweetwater/Bonita position will be vacated by David Krogh on June 30, 2012 when his second term as a commissioner expires. With over eight years as a commissioner, two as Chair, Commissioner Krogh is one of the longest serving members of the GMOC, and we are grateful for his service.

The GMOC’s review is structured around three timeframes:

1. A Fiscal Year Cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. This 2012 Annual Report focuses on fiscal year July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011;
2. The second half of 2011 and beginning of 2012 to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe, and to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events; and
3. A five-year forecast to assure that the GMOC has a future orientation. The period from January 2012 through December 2016 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns.

The GMOC annually distributes questionnaires to the relevant city departments and public facility and service agencies to monitor the status of Threshold Standards

compliance. When the questionnaires are completed, the GMOC reviews them and deliberates issues of compliance. They also evaluate the appropriateness of the Threshold Standards, whether they should be amended, and whether any new Threshold Standards should be considered.

1.3 GMOC 2012 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held 11 meetings between October 2011 and May 2012, which were open to the public. Representatives from the city departments and public agencies associated with the threshold compliance questionnaires gave presentations to the Commission and discussed the questionnaires they had completed (attached in Appendix B). Through this process, city staff and the GMOC identified issues and conditions, and they are discussed in this report.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council at a joint meeting, scheduled for June 7, 2012.

1.4 Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast; the latest of which was issued in November 2011. The Forecast provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Copies of the Forecast were distributed with the GMOC questionnaires to help the departments and agencies determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The Growth Forecast from November 2011 through December 2016 indicated an additional 5,900 residential units could be permitted for construction in the city over the next five years, (5,537 in the east and 363 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,107 in the east and 73 units in the west, or just over 1,180 housing units permitted per year on average, citywide.

The projected units permitted per year on average, citywide, is down 232 units from last year's forecast of 1,412 units.

1.5 Report Organization

The 2012 GMOC Annual Report is organized into four sections:

Section 1: Introduction; description of GMOC's role and review process; an explanation of the Residential Growth Forecast; and an outline of the 2012 report

Section 2: A threshold compliance summary in table format

Section 3: A threshold by threshold discussion of issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern (if any), and recommendations

Section 4: Appendices

2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the 2011 annual review cycle. Seven thresholds were met and four were not.

2012 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/10 THROUGH 6/30/11				
Threshold	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential of Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. Libraries		X	X	X
2. Police				
Priority I	X			
Priority II		X	X	X
3. Traffic		X	X	X
4. Fire/EMS		X	X	X
5. Parks and Recreation				
<i>Land</i>	X			
<i>Facilities</i>	X			
6. Fiscal	X			
7. Drainage	X			
8. Schools				
CV Elementary School District	X			
Sweetwater Union High School District	X			
9. Sewer	X			
10. Air Quality	X			
11. Water	X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

3.1 LIBRARIES

Threshold Standard:

Population ratio: 500 square feet (gross) of adequately equipped and staffed library facility per 1,000 population. The city shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the city will not fall below the city-wide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

LIBRARIES			
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.
5-Year Projection (2016)	266,126	95,400	358
12-Month Projection (12/31/12)	252,271	95,400	378
FY 2010-11	246,496	102,000/92,000*	414/387*
FY 2009-10	233,692	102,000	436
FY 2008-09	233,108	102,000	437
FY 2007-08	231,305	102,000	441
FY 2006-07	227,723	102,000	448
FY 2005-06	223,423	102,000	457
FY 2004-05	220,000	102,000	464
FY 2003-04	211,800	102,000	482
FY 2002-03	203,000	102,000	502
FY 2001-02	195,000	102,000	523
FY 2000-01	187,444	102,000	544
FY 1999-00	178,645	102,000	571

*After closure of EastLake Library in June 2011

Issue: After eight consecutive years, the city continues to be out of compliance with the threshold standard.

Discussion: Since the GMOC's last annual report, the Libraries total square footage deficit grew, primarily due to closure of the Eastlake Library in June 2011. A portion of the lost square footage was recouped, however, with the recent opening of a modular storefront library in the Otay Ranch Town Center.

Although the 3,400-square-foot library at the Otay Ranch Town Center will not close the threshold standard gap, it will serve as an interim facility for at least three years, and possibly until funds are available to construct a permanent library in eastern Chula Vista. As has been discussed in previous GMOC reports, it may be up to ten years before adequate Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) funding is available to construct a 30,000-square-foot library in eastern Chula Vista's Rancho del Rey.

However, with development of the Eastern Urban Center (EUC)/Millenia Project underway, construction of a 30,000-square-foot library in the EUC may occur before the Rancho del Rey is constructed because a Development Agreement between the city and the developer ties developer entitlements to delivery of library space in the EUC. The agreement states that, within a year of adoption of a new Library Master Plan, the developer is required to enter into a Library Delivery Agreement with the city that identifies a location, as well as timing, for delivery of library space.

Adoption of a new Library Master Plan is on hold, however. A draft of the Library Facilities Master Plan was completed and agendaized for City Council review on July 12, 2011, but was pulled from the agenda because Council requested that the Library Strategic Plan be updated to replace the existing one, which expired in 2006, before a Facilities Master Plan is brought forward. A Strategic Plan may not be completed for another 12-18 months, which would postpone consideration of the updated Master Plan for at least as long.

The GMOC believes that postponing adoption of an updated Library Master Plan for up to two years is unacceptable because 1) It is important to adopt interim and long-term solutions to the current square footage deficit; 2) The clock will start ticking for delivery of a library in the EUC, once an updated Master Plan is adopted; and 3) The city's Finance Department needs the Master Plan update to update the PFDIF, which will ensure that adequate funds are being collected to implement the Master Plan.

Recommendation: That City Council, without further delay, adopt a Library Facilities Master Plan that provides interim and long-term solutions to bring the library system into conformance.

3.2 POLICE

Threshold Standard:

Priority One

Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority One emergency calls throughout the city within seven minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority One calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less.

Priority Two

Urgent Response: Respond to 57% of the Priority Two urgent calls throughout the city within seven minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority Two calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less.

Threshold Finding:	Priority One:	Compliant
	Priority Two:	Non-Compliant

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response (Priority One)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority Two)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
Actual			
Emergency Response (Priority One)	85.7%	7 minutes	4:40 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority Two)	49.8%	7 minutes	10:06 min./sec.

3.2.1 Priority One Threshold Findings

PRIORITY ONE – Emergency Response Calls For Service				
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time	Average Dispatch Time ¹
Threshold		81.0%	5:30	
FY 2010-11	657 of 64,695	85.7%	4:40	N/A
FY 2009-10	673 of 68,145	85.1%	4:28	N/A
FY 2008-09	788 of 70,051	84.6%	4:26	N/A
FY 2007-08	1,006 of 74,192	87.9%	4:19	N/A
FY 2006-07	976 of 74,277	84.5%	4:59	N/A
FY 2005-06	1,068 of 73,075	82.3%	4:51	N/A
FY 2004-05	1,289 of 74,106	80.0%	5:11	N/A
FY 2003-04	1,322 of 71,000	82.1%	4:52	N/A
FY 2002-03	1,424 of 71,268	80.8%	4:55	N/A
FY 2001-02²	1,539 of 71,859	80.0%	5:07	N/A
FY 2000-01	1,734 of 73,977	79.7%	5:13	N/A
FY 1999-00	1,750 of 76,738	75.9%	5:21	N/A
CY 1999³	1,890 of 74,405	70.9%	5:50	N/A
FY 1997-98	1,512 of 69,196	74.8%	5:47	N/A
FY 1996-97	1,968 of 69,904	83.8%	4:52	N/A
FY 1995-96	1,915 of 71,197	83.0%	4:46	N/A

Issue: None

Discussion: During the period under review, the Police Department responded to 85.7% of Priority One Emergency Response calls within 7 minutes, .6 percent better than the previous year, and 5.7% better than the Threshold Standard requires.

With an average response time of 4 minutes and 40 seconds, the response time was 12 seconds longer than the previous year; however, it was still 50 seconds better than the Threshold Standard requires.

¹ Officers are dispatched while in the field on patrol, therefore there is no time delay when a call is dispatched.

² All figures after FY 2000-2001 (as well as Priority Two figures on the next page) reflect a change in citizen-initiated call reporting criteria. Prior to FY 01-02, citizen-initiated calls were determined according to call type; they are now determined according to received source.

³ The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

3.2.2

Non-Compliant Priority Two Threshold Standard

PRIORITY II – Urgent Response Calls for Service				
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time	Average Dispatch Time ¹
Threshold		57.0%	7:30	
FY 2010-11	21,500 of 64,695	49.8%	10:06	N/A
FY 2009-10	22,240 of 68,145	49.8%	9:55	N/A
FY 2008-09	22,686 of 70,051	53.5%	9:16	N/A
FY 2007-08	23,955 of 74,192	53.1%	9:18	N/A
FY 2006-07	24,407 of 74,277	43.3%	11:18	N/A
FY 2005-06	24,876 of 73,075	40.0%	12:33	N/A
FY 2004-05	24,923 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40	N/A
FY 2003-04	24,741 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50	N/A
FY 2002-03	22,871 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24	N/A
FY 2001-02	22,199 of 71,859	45.6%	10:04	N/A
FY 2000-01	25,234 of 73,977	47.9%	9:38	N/A
FY 1999-00	23,898 of 76,738	46.4%	9:37	N/A
CY 1999	20,405 of 74,405	45.8%	9:35	N/A
FY 1997-98	22,342 of 69,196	52.9%	8:13	N/A
FY 1996-97	22,140 of 69,904	62.2%	6:50	N/A
FY 1995-96	21,743 of 71,197	64.5%	6:38	N/A

Issue: Priority Two response times continue to fall short of complying with the Threshold Standard.

Discussion: For the 14th consecutive year, the Threshold Standard for Priority Two - Urgent Response has not been met. The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes, 49.8%, was identical to the previous year's percentage; however, the average response time of 10:06 minutes was 11 seconds longer.

The Police Department reported that it has exhausted all resources with the goal of improving Priority Two response times; and without funding for additional staff, the Priority Two Threshold Standard will remain unmet in the foreseeable future. The City Manager has approved a comprehensive staffing study, which will examine the appropriate staffing levels necessary to achieve compliance with both the existing Priority Two Threshold Standard and a modified one.

The modified Threshold Standard comes as a result of staff analyzing data and working with the Police Department during top-to-bottom review of the Growth Management Program. The GMOC will be proposing changes to the Priority Two Threshold Standard when it brings the top-to-

¹ Officers are dispatched while in the field on patrol, therefore there is no time delay when a call is dispatched.

bottom documents to City Council later this year. The changes will clear up some confusing aspects of how response times are currently reported and establish a response time goal that is reasonable and appropriate.

Recommendation: That City Council support a change to the Priority Two Threshold Standard when it is brought to them in top-to-bottom's final documents.

3.2.3 Consideration of Permanent Eastern Satellite Office

Issue: The concept of a permanent Police Department facility in eastern Chula Vista has not been formally evaluated in several years.

Discussion: Although funding is not currently available to construct a permanent satellite office in eastern Chula Vista, in 2011 the non-profit Chula Vista Police Foundation was able to provide a couple years of funding for the Chula Vista Police Department to open up a small storefront facility in the Otay Ranch Town Center. The facility helps bring police resources closer to the community and to maintain safety in local neighborhoods.

In discussions the GMOC had with the Police Department, both agreed that a permanent satellite facility in eastern Chula Vista could be beneficial, although the concept has not been formally evaluated since about 2005. With the city about to embark on comprehensively updating the Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF), the GMOC believes the idea of establishing a permanent police facility in eastern Chula Vista should be formally evaluated again, before the PFDIF update, so that any need for fees can be included in the update.

Recommendation: That the Police Department evaluate a possible permanent satellite facility in eastern Chula Vista for Council consideration, prior to the next comprehensive Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) update.

3.3 TRAFFIC

Threshold Standard:

Citywide: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) "C" or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS "D" can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

West of I-805: Those intersections which do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

Issue: Two arterial segments were non-compliant with the Threshold Standard.

Discussion: During the period under review, two arterial segments were non-compliant. The first, Heritage Road northbound from Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road, did not meet the Threshold Standard, exceeding Level of Service (LOS) “D” for more than two hours during peak hours. During the previous review period, it was compliant, but the southbound segment was not. This year, however, the southbound segment was compliant (see table below).

SEGMENT (Limits)	DIR	LOS 2010 (Hours)	LOS 2011 (Hours)	CHANGE
Heritage Road (Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road) (Telegraph Canyon Road to Olympic Parkway)	NB	C(5) D(1) Compliant	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliant	C(-1) D (+4) E (+1)
	SB	C(2) D(4) Non-Compliant	C(6) Compliant	C(+4) D(-4)
Otay Lakes Road (East H Street to Telegraph Canyon Road)	NB	C(6) Compliant	B(1) C(5) Compliant	B(+1) C(-1)
	SB	C(6) Compliant	C (2) D(4) Non-Compliant	C(-4) D(+4)

This same scenario occurred between the 2009 and 2010 review periods. So, for the past three review periods, both the northbound and southbound segments have alternately been in and out of compliance.

Engineering attributed the non-compliant segment to signal timing issues, specifically, that signals were not monitored consistently, due to the loss of the city’s signal systems engineer, who retired. Although the city hired a consultant on an as-needed basis to carry out the city’s Traffic Signal Optimization Program (evaluating and monitoring signal synchronization and corridor coordination), the effect it had on the non-compliant segment was insufficient.

The city budget currently has a halftime position budgeted for the traffic signal program; however, one fulltime Associate Civil Engineer will eventually be in charge of the city’s 268 traffic signals. This person will be in charge of evaluating and monitoring existing signals for desired signal timing improvements and make changes to improve the signal synchronization and corridor coordination. Numerous signal systems/ corridors will be analyzed for phasing and timing improvements, based on traffic data collected by city forces, which will help determine the need for re-timing analysis. Significant improvement in traffic flow characteristics, including fewer vehicle stops and delays, should result.

The second non-compliant segment was Otay Lakes Road, southbound between East H Street and Telegraph Canyon Road; it was operating at LOS "D" for four hours, exceeding the threshold standard by two hours (see table above). There is a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) funded project allocated for this non-compliant segment, which includes widening Otay Lakes Road in front of Southwestern College and adding a third southbound lane and raised median to the entire block (down to Mira Costa). Construction will occur in spring and summer 2013.

Recommendation: That City Council continue to support city engineers in their efforts to implement improvements that will result in Threshold compliance, such as: 1) funding a signal systems engineer, and 2) timely completing the Otay Lakes Road widening project.

3.4 FIRE and EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Threshold Standard:

Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times			COMPARISON	
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes	Average Response Time for 80% of Calls,	Average Travel Time
THRESHOLD		80.0%		
FY 2011	9,916	78.1	6:46	3:41
FY 2010	10,296	85%	5:09	3:40
FY 2009	9,363	84.0%	4:46	3:33
FY 2008	9,883	86.9%	6:31	3:17
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36
CY 2005	9,907	81.6%	7:05	3:31
FY 2003-04	8,420	72.9%	7:38	3:32
FY 2002-03	8,088	75.5%	7:35	3:43
FY 2001-02	7,626	69.7%	7:53	3:39
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%	7:02	3:18
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%		3:29

Note: Reporting period for FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 is for October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003. The difference in 2004 performance when compared to 2003 is within the 2.5% range of expected yearly variation and not statistically significant.

Issue: The Fire Department failed to respond to at least 80% of calls within 7 minutes; therefore it was non-compliant with the Threshold Standard.

Discussion: The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes (78.1%) dropped by nearly 7% from Fiscal Year 2010 (85%) to Fiscal Year 2011 (78.1). While 78.1% is only slightly below the Threshold Standard of 80%, the drop in one year is significant. The Fire Department attributed the decline to slower turn-out times – the amount of time it takes an engine to leave a station once an alarm is sounded – due, largely, to staff performance. To address the situation, the Fire Department has identified some “Lean” program techniques and solutions, including implementing visual aids and response time reports. For instance, clocks that count down when the tone goes off are being installed in each fire station. In addition, monthly response time reports from each station are being sent to the Deputy Fire Chief so that he can be kept up-to-date on status.

Medical (84.9%) and other emergencies (10%) accounted for the majority of calls responded to during the period under review. The percentage of calls for fires was 5.1%.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the Fire Department to pursue turn-out improvement strategies that will ensure that the Threshold Standard will be met.

3.4.2 Fire Facilities Master Plan

Issue: Delay of a council-approved Fire Facilities Master Plan update will hinder the Finance Department’s efforts to complete a comprehensive Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) update.

Discussion: The Fire Facility Master Plan update is complete, including a fiscal analysis to accompany the document. Before the Master Plan is brought to Council for consideration, the Fire Department will schedule a series of public information meetings, where they will share the document with the community and solicit input.

Recommendation: That City Council ensure expeditious completion of the public information meetings and scheduling for Council consideration so the updated Fire Facilities Master Plan can be included in the next PFDIF update.

3.5 PARKS and RECREATION

Threshold Standard:

Population Ratio: Three acres of neighborhood and community park land with appropriate facilities per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.5.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: Although the Threshold Standard is currently compliant, there is a possibility that it will fall short by 2016.

Discussion: The Parks and Recreation Department noted that there is the possibility of a park acreage shortfall in eastern Chula Vista by 2016 (up to 24.9 acres, which would calculate to only 2.83 acres per 1,000 residents east of I-805, rather than the 3 acres/1000 required by the Threshold Standard). Parks and Recreation staff reported that park delivery would be expedited and the potential shortfall could be avoided if physical issues on individual Otay Ranch Village 2 park sites (including a water line relocation issue) are resolved; and if work commences on individual Park Master Plan design.

Their report also noted the need to review the rate of Park Acquisition and Development (PAD) fee collection and fund balances to ensure monies will be available when needed.

Recommendation: That City Council direct Parks and Recreation staff to closely monitor timely preparation of park master plan designs and land development phasing to keep it in compliance with the Threshold Standard.

3.5.2 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

Issue: Delay of a council-approved Parks and Recreation Master Plan update will hinder the Finance Department's efforts to complete a comprehensive PFDIF update.

Discussion: A draft Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan update was considered at a Council workshop in December 2011, where Council instructed staff to further assess options for the city's Landmark Park. Staff is still involved in that process, and it is uncertain when the updated Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan will be taken back to Council for their consideration.

Recommendation: That City Council request staff return the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan to them for action.

3.6 FISCAL

Threshold Standards:

1. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5- to 7-year period.
2. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.6.1 **Updating Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF)**

Issue: A comprehensive Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) update has not been done since 2006 and must be a priority.

Discussion: There are currently five major facilities planned for construction using PFDIF funds. They are (listed in order of construction priority provided by the Finance Department):

1. Rancho del Rey Library
2. EUC Fire Station
3. EUC Library
- 4./5. Otay Ranch Village 4 Aquatics Center & Recreation Facility

The Finance Department has existing debt obligations and a commitment to fully fund the debt service reserve before funding construction of new facilities. The Finance Department also recognizes that, with the city's current budget issues, the ability to staff and operate existing facilities is very limited, in the short-term. And, until budget issues improve, staffing new facilities would not be possible.

The GMOC wants to ensure that adequate fees are being collected to pay for construction of the new public facilities, acknowledging that construction may be several years away, and is concerned that the current amount of PFDIF fees being used to pay debt service exceeds what was originally assumed when the PFDIF was last updated. This is one reason why the Finance Department should be prepared to update the PFDIF as soon as possible.

Another reason is that two development proposals are currently being processed, which may result in several thousand more entitled dwelling units. The first proposal, from Otay Land Company, will go before Council in 6-9 months; the second proposal, from JPB, will go before Council in approximately 18 months. If additional dwelling units are approved, as a result, the PFDIF should be updated within 120 days of Council's action on each item. By then, the pending master plan updates for Fire, Libraries, and Parks and Recreation should be adopted by Council, so an accurate facilities amount can be calculated.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the Finance Department to begin the process of comprehensively updating the Public Facilities Development Improvement Fees (PFDIF) so that it will be completed within 120 days of Council's action on proposed unit increases.

3.7 DRAINAGE

Threshold Standards:

1. Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed city engineering standards as set forth in the subdivision manual adopted by city council Resolution No. 11175 on February 23, 1983, as may be amended from time to time.
2. The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the city's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet the goals and objectives above.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.7.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels

Issue: Adequate funding for channel maintenance is an ongoing problem.

Discussion: While not a direct result of growth, the GMOC recognizes that funding to maintain existing channels in western Chula Vista is challenging because environmental permits to allow specific maintenance tasks are expensive. In addition, the Public Works Department reported that they have struggled to fulfill current state requirements for storm sewer systems, due to insufficient staffing levels. Specifically, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board mandates specific maintenance tasks for Operation and Maintenance of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System and Structural Controls, and the city's Public Works staff has been unable to fulfill all of the state requirements.

City engineers warned that insufficient funding could result in: 1) an increased potential for flooding, particularly in western Chula Vista; 2) collapse of corroded corrugated metal pipe (CMP); and 3) erosion, particularly in natural channels and canyons. For the city's National

Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, this could result in impairment of water quality within receiving waters and create a condition of non-compliance with the Municipal Permit, exposing the city to penalties.

Recommendation: That City Council direct Engineering staff to closely monitor the status of channel maintenance to keep it in compliance with the Threshold Standard.

3.8 SCHOOLS

Threshold Standard:

The city shall annually provide the two local school districts with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed;
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities;
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
4. Other relevant information the district(s) desire(s) to communicate to the city and the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).

The growth forecast and school district response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: CVESD – Compliant
SUHSD – Compliant

3.8.1 School Districts Updates

Issue: None.

Discussion: Both Chula Vista Elementary School District and Sweetwater Union High School District reported that they have adequate facilities to accommodate students now and in the next five years. Their respective summaries are below:

Chula Vista Elementary School District

Construction of a two-story K-6 school in Otay Ranch Village 11 has begun and should be open by July 2013. With the addition of this school, the district expects to have adequate facilities to house all projected students for up to five years. Bonding is financing the new school, which is the first school to be constructed in the district in five years.

Wolfe Canyon Elementary School, with 38 classrooms, is currently the largest school in the district, serving Villages 2, 7 and 11 in Otay Ranch. Enrollment has not declined in any of the schools east of Interstate 805.

Sweetwater Union High School District

District-wide, enrollment is declining, primarily in the older northwestern schools; schools in the southwest area are growing, but only slightly. District-wide, they are expecting a reduction of 400 students next year.

With the construction of Olympian High School approximately five years ago, there is not a capacity problem in the foreseeable future, but funding cuts to the district have led to larger class sizes. Both a new middle school and a new high school will be built at Hunte Parkway and Eastlake Parkway in about five years.

3.9 SEWER

Threshold Standards:

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards as set forth in the subdivision manual adopted by city council Resolution No. 11175 on February 12, 1983, as may be amended from time to time.
2. The city shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Sewer Authority with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the city's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth, or the city engineering department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include the following:
 - a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed;
 - b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth;
 - c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
 - d. Other relevant information.

The growth forecast and authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity

<i>SEWAGE - Flow and Treatment Capacity</i>					
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	08/09 Fiscal Year	09/10 Fiscal Year	Projection for next 18 months	Projection for next 5 years	Projection for "Build-out"
Average Flow	16.517	16.219	16.916**	18.542	26.2
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

*Buildout Projection based on Chula Vista Wastewater Master Plan (2005) utilizing the "Preferred Alternative" model as was adopted in the last General Plan Update.

**Assumes a total of 1752 EDU's per year

Issue: None.

Discussion: Sewer continues to be in compliance with the Threshold Standard and is projected to remain in compliance for the next ten years. As the city begins to approach build-out projections, however, additional treatment capacity will need to be obtained. The 2005 Wastewater Master Plan estimated that an additional 5.336 Million Gallons per Day (MGD) of additional capacity would be needed. However, City of Chula Vista residents continue to conserve water both indoors and outdoors, so sewer discharge has been decreasing. This means that the build-out treatment capacity required could be less than what the 2005 Master Plan estimated. Staff is working on an update to the 2005 Master Plan in order to verify the build-out treatment capacity needs of the city; it should be completed in 2013. Staff will then compare the cost per gallon of two options for acquiring additional treatment capacity: 1) Constructing a sewer treatment facility in Chula Vista; or 2) Purchasing additional treatment capacity rights from other agencies within the San Diego Metropolitan System.

Since the rate of city growth continues to be slower than projected and conservation efforts continue, the city has additional time to better understand the options available to meet the build-out needs. The city will continue its diligent efforts to secure treatment capacity before it is needed.

3.10 AIR QUALITY

Threshold Standard:

The GMOC shall be provided with an Annual Report which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the city's development regulations, policies, and procedures relate to, and/are consistent with current, applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the city toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the city has achieved compliance.

The city shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the effect of those efforts/programs on the city of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.10.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: The City of Chula Vista's development standards meet and/or exceed regional, state, and federal air quality regulations.

- Chula Vista leads the region with its ambitious ***Climate Action Program/greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target*** and policies and initiatives that contribute to lowering criteria air pollutants.
- Chula Vista recently became the first jurisdiction in southern California to expand its *Climate Action Program* to include **climate "adaption" strategies** designed to reduce the community's vulnerability to expected local climate change impacts, including more poor air quality and heat wave days. Some of the 11 strategies (such as cool paving, shade trees and cool roofs) will directly help improve local air quality by mitigating the urban heat island effect and will help educate community members about air quality levels as the strategies begin to be implemented over the next 3 years.
- Over the last year, the city, in collaboration with other regional jurisdictions through the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) updated the Regional Transportation Plan to include a regional **"Sustainable Communities Strategy,"** which would ultimately lower emissions by 7% by 2020 and 13% by 2035. The new plan is the first in the state to Comply with California Senate Bill 375 that directs local governments to reduce transportation-

related greenhouse gas emissions through more sustainable land use practices.

- The city's **Sustainable Communities program** provides technical support to permit applicants, contractors, and other public agencies on energy efficiency building measures, since energy efficiency and renewable energy opportunities contribute to local air quality improvement.
- The city's **Design Manual** was recently updated to emphasize improved air quality by encouraging urban forests and sustainable design concepts, including multi-use, compact development favoring pedestrians, biking and public transit that reduce air pollution.
- **Air Quality Improvement Plans (AQIPS)**, which are required for new larger developments, were completed for Otay Ranch Villages 8 West and 9, representing 6,050 residential units and 1.8 million square feet of commercial space.

The city is currently working with community stakeholders to develop policies and regulations for evaluating the siting of future Electrical Generating Facilities (EGFs) within the city to better protect public health and safety. It also continues to increase its participation in several non-development-related air quality programs/actions, including two newer additions:

- *Students Taking Active Routes to Schools (STARTS) Project* – Developing and distributing a suggested school route pedestrian/bike map, facilitating non-motorized transportation and ultimately improving local air quality.
- *Public CNG Dispenser* – A new Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) fueling infrastructure at the Public Works Corp Yard allowing residents and other commercial fleets to refuel their vehicles at the site.

3.11 WATER

Threshold Standards:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the city a service availability letter from the water district for each project.
2. The city shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:
 - a. Water availability to the city and planning area, considering both short- and long-term perspectives;
 - b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed;
 - c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth;

- d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
- e. Other relevant information the district(s) desire to communicate to the city and GMOC.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands

Issue: None.

Discussion: Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority serve the City of Chula Vista, and both reported that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years. Specific data is available in the Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority questionnaires, located in Appendix B of this report.

Otay Water District

The Otay Water District (OWD) has developed, and annually reviews, its Water Resources Master Plan (WRMP), which relies on growth projection data provided by SANDAG, the City of Chula Vista, and the development community; it serves as a guide to reevaluate the best alternatives for providing reliable water system facilities. Integral to the annual review process is ensuring that capital improvement program projects are funded and constructed in a timely manner, and verifying that they correspond with development construction activities and water demand growth that require new or upgraded facilities.

Service reliability levels have been enhanced with the addition of major facilities that provide access to existing storage reservoirs and increase supply capacity from the Helix Water District Levy Water Treatment Plant, the City of San Diego South Bay Water Reclamation Plant, and the City of San Diego Otay Water Treatment Plant.

The Otay Water District, in concert with the City of Chula Vista, also continues to expand the use of recycled water. The Otay Water District continues to actively require the development of recycled water facilities and related demand generation within new development projects within the City of Chula Vista.

Sweetwater Authority

Sweetwater Authority's 2010 Water Facilities Master Plan lists estimated costs and almost all proposed projects. Several maintenance and upgrade programs where pipelines, valves and other facilities are constantly being renewed. Also, the desalination facility capacity may be increased, and the Perdue Treatment plant is being upgraded to meet new treatment standards. These projects allow the Authority to continue to provide service in the near- and long-term.

4.0 Appendices

4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast

4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires